1	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP STEPHEN H. WARREN (S.B. #136895)	
2	KAREN RINEHART (S.B. #185996) 400 South Hope Street, 18th Floor	
3	Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 430-6000 Facsimile: (213) 430-6407 Email: swarren@omm.com	
4		
5	krinehart@omm.com	
6	TANCRED V. SCHIAVONI (pro hac vice) ADAM P. HABERKORN (pro hac vice)	
7	Times Square Tower 7 Times Square	
8	New York, NY 10036 Telephone: (212) 326-2000	
9	Email: tschiavoni@omm.com ahaberkorn@omm.com	
10	EMMA L. JONES(<i>pro hac vice</i>) 1701 N. Harwood St., Suite 1700 Dallas, TX 75201	
11		
12	Telephone: (972) 360-1900 Email: eljones@omm.com	
13	Attorneys for Pacific Indemnity Company, Insurance	
14	Company of North America, and Pacific Emplo Insurance Company	
15	1 7	
16	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION	
17		
18	In re:	Case No. 23-40523-WJL
19	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF OAKLAND, a California corporation sole	Chapter 11
20		CERTIFICATION OF ADAM P.
21	Debtor.	HABERKORN IN SUPPORT OF ORDER GRANTING INSURERS'
22		MOTION FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER PERMITTING INSURER EXPERTS
23		AND/OR CONSULTANTS TO HAVE ACCESS TO PROOFS OF CLAIMS
24		AND SUPPLEMENTS [DKT. 522]
25		Judge: Hon. William J. Lafferty
26		
27		
28		
	22 40522 Doo# 704 5354; 04/46/04 5	intered: 01/16/04 15:50:00 Dece 1 of 4
ase	23-40523 Doc# 781 Filed: 01/16/24 E	Intered: 01/16/24 15:52:36 Page 1 of 4

I, Adam P. Haberkorn, hereby certify as follows:

- 1. I submit this certification (this "Certification") in support of entry of (a) the proposed form of order attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** granting the (the "Proposed Experts Order") the Moving Insurers' Motion For Entry of an Order Permitting Insurer Experts and/or Consultants to Have Access to Sexual Abuse Proofs of Claims and Supplements [Dkt. No. 522] (the "Experts Motion") in part and denying it in without prejudice to the Moving Insurers filing a subsequent motion for access to information redacted from the proofs of claim.
- 2. On December 1, 2023, the Court held a hearing on Pacific's motion to permit Experts to review the proofs of claim. At the conclusion of that hearing, the Court granted the insurers experts/professionals access to Proofs of Claims in accordance, subject to the redaction of personal identifying information from the Proofs of Claims. Transcript of December 1, 2023 hearing at 19:2-6 (attached hereto at **Exhibit 2**) ("So to this extent, I am granting the insurance companies motion to the extent I'm suggesting today, that I think that information, other than what I'm loosely calling PII, should be shareable with the insurance companies, experts/professionals.").
- 3. The Court held that the parties were to replicate the redaction process to anonymize the Proofs of Claim set forth in the Bar Date Order so that "the name of the claimant or maybe the address of the claimant or something else that might reasonably identify the claimant as that person could be shielded from experts and professionals, then I think the other information I think is relevant to what experts do." Transcript of December 1, 2023 hearing at 15:16-25. The Court went on to explain that such other information goes directly to analyzing, for example, the kind of claim this is, how old the claimant is, what the circumstances of the claim are, and how often the abuse happened. *See* Transcript of December 1, 2023 hearing at 15:25-16:1-6.
- 4. In accordance with the Court's ruling, the proposed Order provides for the redaction of each claimant's name, address, email address, telephone number(s), Social Security Number,

jail or prison number (if applicable), and month of birth (collectively, "PII") from the Proofs of Claims.

- 5. The parties exchanged drafts of the proposed order but have been unable to agreement with the Tort Committee which seeks open ended license to redact any information about a claimant rendering the proofs useless for any investigation and impossible for a consultant to ever determine whether a given claimant has filed a timely proof of claim in this case or multiple suits against multiple dioceses and non-diocese defendants..
- 6. The other point of dispute is whether the proposed Order should require that Debtor and/or Tort Committee to provide a service list of the plaintiff counsel that filed the proofs of claim so Pacific may serve the subsequent motion on notice seeking an order allowing experts and consultants to review the proofs of claim without redactions that the Court authorized the insurers to bring. Transcript of December 1, 2023 hearing at 15:16-25. The Tort Committee objected that the Expert Motion was not served on the plaintiff counsel. Denying the parties the service list will frustrate Pacific's effort to seek relief.
- 7. The Bar Date Orders entered in *In re Diocese of Santa Rosa, In re Diocese of San Francisco, In re Diocese of Camden* and a host of other bankruptcies all permit insurers' experts and consultants to review the proofs of claim without redaction or other restrictions on access which is essential to investigate the claims:
 - a. Order: (1) Fixing Time for Filing Proofs of Claim; (2) Approving Proof of Claim Forms; (3) Providing Confidential Protocols; and (4) Approving Form and Manner of Notice, In re: The Roman Catholic Bishop of Santa Rosa, No. 23-10113 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. July 25, 2023), Dkt. No. 327 at 8 ("Permitted Party List" includes "Insurers for the Debtor, together with their successors, administrators, retrocessionaires, reinsurers, reinsurance intermediaries, and their counsel and other professionals...") (emphasis added); and
 - b. Order: (1) Fixing Time for Filing Proofs of Claim; (2) Approving Proof of Claim Forms; (3) Providing Confidentiality Protocols; and (4) Approving Form and Manner of Notice, In re: The Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco, No. 23-30564 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2023), Dkt. No. 337 at 9-10 ("Permitted Party List" includes

28